



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10 034,924	12 26 2001	Stephen Moxham	108298633US	1417

25096 7590 03 20 2003

PERKINS COIE LLP  
PATENT-SEA  
P.O. BOX 1247  
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, ALEXANDER O

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2826

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034 924

Examiner

Alexander O Williams

Applicant(s)

MOXHAM ET AL

Art Unit

2826

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 to 15, 18 to 30, 32 to 41, 43 to 53, 55 to 59 and 61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 to 15, 18 to 30, 32 to 41, 43 to 53, 55 to 59 and 61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/26/01 is/are a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3,6 6) ☐ Other

Art Unit: 2826

Serial Number: 10/034924 Attorney's Docket #: 108298633US

Filing Date: 12/26/2001;

Applicant: Moxham et al.

Examiner: Alexander Williams

Applicant's Amendment/election of species of figures 3A-3D (claims 1 to 15, 18 to 30, 32 to 41, 43- to 53, 55 to 59 and 61) in Paper # 7, filed 1/10/03, has been acknowledged.

Claims 16, 17, 31, 42, 54, 60, 62 to 87 and 88 to 123 have been canceled.

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 to 15, 18 to 30, 32 to 41, 43 to 53, 55 to 59 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,228,548 B1).

For example, in claim 1 and similar claims 21, 32, 44 and 57, King et al. (figures 1 to 5) specifically figure 1 show an apparatus for supporting a microelectronic substrate, comprising: a support member **20** having a support surface configured to carry a microelectronic substrate **26**; a first connection structure **(28 with no electrically connection to the 26)** carried by the support member and configured to remain decoupled from a micro electronic substrate when the support member carries the microelectronic substrate, the first connection structure having a first bond site **(portion under 30, shown as 58 in figures 3 and 4)** configured to receive a flowable conductive material **30**, the first connection structure further having a first number of first elongated members connected to and extending outwardly from the first bond site, wherein none of the first elongated members is configured to be electrically connected to the microelectronic substrate; and a second connection structure **42,40** carried by the support member, the second connection structure having a second bond site **(portion under 30, shown as 58 in figures 3 and 4)** configured to receive a flowable conductive material **30**, the second connection structure being decoupled to the microelectronic substrate when the support member carries the microelectronic substrate, the second connection structure further having a second number of second elongated members extending outwardly from the second bond site, but fail to explicitly show the second number being the same as the first number. However, it would be a matter of designer choice to have the second number being the same as the first number.

Note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed dimensions or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen dimensions or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the teaching of King et al.'s different number of elongated members for the purpose of using high wiring density in WSI wirebonding operations and the surplus unneeded chips.

The listed references are cited as of interest to this application, but not applied at this time.


Field of Search	Date
U.S. Class and subclass: 257/784, 786, 666, 668, 698, 690-693, 696-698	3/17/03
Other Documentation: foreign patents and literature in 257/784, 786, 666, 668, 698, 690-693, 696-698	3/17/03
Electronic data base(s): U.S. Patents EAST	3/17/03

***Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 2800 via the Technology Center 2800 Fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4-5B15. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Technology Center 2800 Fax Center number is (703) 308-7722 or 24. Only Papers related to Technology Center 2800 APPLICATIONS SHOULD BE FAXED to the GROUP 2800 FAX CENTER.***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or any earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to **Examiner Alexander Williams** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-4863**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Technology Center 2800 receptionist** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-0956**.

3/17/03

  
Primary Examiner  
Alexander O. Williams